



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

*cu*

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/569,306	02/21/2006	Ralf-Dieter Busse	023162334USWO	7856
23552	7590	08/20/2007		
MERCHANT & GOULD PC P.O. BOX 2903 MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402-0903			EXAMINER ABRAMS, NEIL	
			ART UNIT 2839	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 08/20/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/569,306

Applicant(s)

BUSSE ET AL.

Examiner

Neil Abrams

Art Unit

2839

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 2-21-29006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-36 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5, 7-24, 26-36 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 6, 25 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date: \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

### DETAILED ACTION

DE9306970, full copy should be supplied.

1. Claims 1, 5, 7, 8, 9, 10, 15, 17-19, 20, 24, 26-29, 35, 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Busse in view of Germany 20120690, Europe 0671856 and Wrabel.
2. Busse housing, figures 1, 4, 7 include cavity for pcb 6 or pcbs 6, 6 input and output sides, a connecting strip 22 to be joined to a front part of the housing (see figure 7 at 39), the input contacts in the form of a strip with contacts having idcs and fork ends, figure 1, arranged to move as an unit for mounting and removal. Busse lacks "output contacts detachably connected to the pcb". Germany 690, figure 5a, Europe 836 and Wrabel at 119, 118 all show distribution boxes with similar input and output faces. It therefore would have been obvious to use connectors like those at 22 on "both" faces of the figure 4 housing 21. This would enable use of similar equipment on both faces to save expense. For claim 20, obvious to apply same change to Busse figure 7 with dual row connector 22 on both faces to form input and output just as secondary references have input, output on opposite faces. For claim 5 stop disclosed in Busse, paragraph 0029, last 7 lines. Claim 7, choice of metal deemed obvious design. Claim 8, obvious to use separate housing parts as in Wrabel for ease of assembly. Claims 9, 10, see Busse forks at 14, 14. Claim 15 met by separate panel as used in Busse at 22. Claim 17, , relates to intention and define no structure over Busse. Claim 18, met by figure 7 as modified. Claim 19 reads on Busse connecting strip. Claims 24, 26-29, 35, 36 covered by above discussion.

3. Claims 2, 3, 4, 21, 22, 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the references as applied to claims 1, 20 above, and further in view of Baron.
4. Busse, figures 4, 7 lacks screw and threaded means. Baron, figure 7 uses threaded means that meet claim limitations. Obvious to use such feature in Busse device for ease of assembly of connector strips to housing.
5. Claims 7, 11-14, 26, 30-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the references as applied to claims 1, 20 above, and further in view of Tomura.
6. Busse lacks metal housing and grounding spring contacts on the housing. Tomura, figure 1 includes metal housing and such contact at 14 obvious to include metal housing and such type contact provide a grounding level in the pcb circuit and for protection against EMI.
7. Claims 1, 5, 7, 8, 11, 15, 17, 18, 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Germany 20120960 in view of Heng and Tomura.
8. Germany, figure 3, 5a, 5c has housing 38 with cavity and pcb 15 in the cavity and contact strips 2a, 2a on each face, detachable connected at front part 30, 2b movable away from the pcb and having contacts with fork parts 27. Germany lacks idcs for connection to input. Heng at 3, 30, has such contacts for connection to wires urged by pusher 40. Obvious to use such type contact and pusher in Germany at each wire connection position to enable easier connection to wires. Claims 5, 7, 8, 15 etc. relate

to structural details that do not seen at issue, for claims 7, 11 obvious to use a metal housing and ground contact in view of Tomura figure 1 at 4, 10, 14.

9. Claims 1-5, 7, 8, 11, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20-24, 26, 27, 30, 34, 35, 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wrabel in view of Vignoli, Busse, Tomura and Baron.

10. For claims 1, 20, Wrabel figure 9, includes wiring distribution housing with stacked pcbs 110, 114, but lacks connector strips with fork and idc type contacts. Vignoli shows connector (figure 6) with such features to be a standard type as does Busse at 22, 4, 9 who also shows use of such connector at edge of pcb in distribution housing. Obvious to use such type connectors with idc/fork contacts in Wrabel at pcb edges 119, 118, 132 to apply input and output in manner that seems intended by Wrabel and further suggested by Busse. For claims 2-5, 7, 11, etc, obvious to use screw means, metal housing and spring ground contact in view of Baron and Tomura as discussed above. Claims 7, 8 etc, relate to material and structure of the housing are considered obvious variations that may not be at issue. *Claim 19, met by use of Vignoli.*

11. Claims 6, 25 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

12. Applicant asked if any dependent claims, including 6,25 relate to features known in the art and not separately at issue.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Neil Abrams at telephone number 571-272-2089

  
NEIL ABRAMS  
PRIMARY EXAMINER